arXiv:1602.07365v1 [cs.CG] 24 Feb 2016

Constrained Generalized Delaunay Graphs Are Plane Spanners[†]

Prosenjit Bose[‡] Jean-Lou De Carufel[§] André van Renssen[¶ ‖]

Abstract

We look at generalized Delaunay graphs in the constrained setting by introducing line segments which the edges of the graph are not allowed to cross. Given an arbitrary convex shape C, a constrained Delaunay graph is constructed by adding an edge between two vertices p and q if and only if there exists a homothet of C with p and q on its boundary that does not contain any other vertices visible to p and q. We show that, regardless of the convex shape C used to construct the constrained Delaunay graph, there exists a constant t (that depends on C) such that it is a plane t-spanner. Furthermore, we reduce the upper bound on the spanning ratio for the special case where the empty convex shape is an arbitrary rectangle to $\sqrt{2} \cdot (2l/s + 1)$, where l and s are the length of the long and short side of the rectangle.

1 Introduction

A geometric graph G is a graph whose vertices are points in the plane and whose edges are line segments between pairs of vertices. A graph G is called plane if no two edges intersect properly. Every edge is weighted by the Euclidean distance between its endpoints. The distance between two vertices u and v in G, denoted by $\delta_G(u, v)$, or simply $\delta(u, v)$ when G is clear from the context, is defined as the sum of the weights of the edges along the shortest path between u and v in G. A subgraph H of G is a t-spanner of G (for $t \geq 1$) if for each pair of vertices u and v, $\delta_H(u, v) \leq t \cdot \delta_G(u, v)$. The smallest value t for which H is a t-spanner is the *spanning ratio* or *stretch factor* of H. The graph G is referred to as the *underlying graph* of H. The spanning properties of various geometric graphs have been studied extensively in the literature (see [7, 15] for an overview of the topic).

[†]Research supported in part by FQRNT, NSERC, and Carleton University's President's 2010 Doctoral Fellowship.

[‡]School of Computer Science, Carleton University. jit@scs.carleton.ca

[§]School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada. jdecaruf@uottawa.ca

[¶]National Institute of Informatics (NII), Tokyo, Japan. andre@nii.ac.jp

[‖]JST, ERATO, Kawarabayashi Large Graph Project.

Most of the research has focused on constructing spanners where the underlying graph is the complete Euclidean geometric graph. We study this problem in a more general setting with the introduction of line segment *constraints*. Specifically, let P be a set of points in the plane and let S be a set of line segments with endpoints in P, with no two line segments intersecting properly. The line segments of S are called *constraints*. Two vertices u and v can *see each other* or *are visible to each other* if and only if either the line segment uv does not properly intersect any constraint or uv is itself a constraint. If two vertices u and v can see each other, the line segment uv is a *visibility edge*. The *visibility graph* of P with respect to a set of constraints S, denoted $Vis(P, S)$, has P as vertex set and all visibility edges as edge set. In other words, it is the complete graph on P minus all edges that properly intersect one or more constraints in S.

This setting has been studied extensively within the context of motion planning amid obstacles. Clarkson [10] was one of the first to study this problem and showed how to construct a linear-sized $(1+\epsilon)$-spanner of $Vis(P, S)$. Subsequently, Das [11] showed how to construct a spanner of $Vis(P, S)$ with constant spanning ratio and constant degree. Bose and Keil [5] showed that the Constrained Delaunay Triangulation is a $4\pi\sqrt{3}/9 \approx 2.419$-spanner of $Vis(P, S)$. The constrained Delaunay graph where the empty convex shape is an equilateral triangle was shown to be a 2-spanner of $Vis(P, S)$ [4]. We look at the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, where the empty convex shape can be any convex polygon.

In the unconstrained setting, it is known that generalized Delaunay graphs are spanners [2], regardless of the convex shape used to construct it. These bounds are very general, but unfortunately not tight. In special cases, better bounds are known. For example, when the empty convex shape is a circle, Dobkin *et al.* [13] showed that the spanning ratio is at most $\pi(1+\sqrt{5})/2 \approx 5.09$. Improving on this, Keil and Gutwin [14] reduced the spanning ratio to $4\pi/3\sqrt{3} \approx 2.42$. Recently, Xia showed that the spanning ratio is at most 1.998 [17]. On the other hand, Bose *et al.* [3] showed a lower bound of 1.58, which is greater than $\pi/2$, which was conjectured to be the tight spanning ratio up to that point. Later, Xia and Zhang [18] improved this to 1.59.

Chew [9] showed that if an equilateral triangle is used instead, the spanning ratio is 2 and this ratio is tight. In the case of squares, Chew [8] showed that the spanning ratio is at most $\sqrt{10} \approx 3.16$. This was later improved by Bonichon *et al.* [1], who showed a tight spanning ratio of $\sqrt{4+2\sqrt{2}} \approx 2.61$.

In this paper, we show that the constrained generalized Delaunay graph G is a spanner whose spanning ratio depends solely on the properties of the empty convex shape C used to create it: We show that G satisfies the α_C-diamond property and the visible-pair κ_C-spanner property (defined in Section 3.2), which implies that it is a t-spanner for:

$$t = \begin{cases} 2\kappa_C \cdot \max\left(\frac{3}{\sin(\alpha_C/2)}, \kappa_C\right), & \textit{if } G \textit{ is a triangulation} \\ 2\kappa_C^2 \cdot \max\left(\frac{3}{\sin(\alpha_C/2)}, \kappa_C\right), & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This proof is not a straightforward adaptation from the work by Bose *et al.* [2] due to the presence of constraints. For example, showing that a region contains no vertices

that are visible to some specific vertex v requires more work that showing that this same region contains no vertices, since we allow vertices in the region that are not visible to v. Induction cannot be applied in a straightforward manner as in the unconstrained case because not all pairs of vertices are visible to each other. Moreover, we prove a slightly stronger result, where constraints are not necessarily edges of the graph. We elaborate on this point in more detail in Section 2.

Though the spanning proof is very general, since it holds for arbitrary convex shapes, its implied spanning ratio is far from tight. To improve on this, we also consider the special case where the empty convex shape C is a rectangle and show that it has spanning ratio at most $\sqrt{2} \cdot (2l/s + 1)$, where l and s are the length of the long and short side of C.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we fix a convex shape C. We assume without loss of generality that the origin lies in the interior of C. A *homothet* of C is obtained by scaling C with respect to the origin, followed by a translation. Thus, a homothet of C can be written as

$$x + \lambda C = \{x + \lambda z : z \in C\},$$

for some scaling factor $\lambda > 0$ and some point x in the interior of C after translation. We refer to x as the *center* of the homothet $x + \lambda C$.

For a given set of vertices P and a set of constraints S, the constrained generalized Delaunay graph is usually defined as follows. Given any two visible vertices p and q, let $C(p, q)$ be any homothet of C with p and q on its boundary. The constrained generalized Delaunay graph contains an edge between p and q if and only if there exists pq is a constraint or there exists a $C(p, q)$ such that there are no vertices of P in the interior of $C(p, q)$ visible to both p and q. We assume that no four vertices lie on the boundary of any homothet of C.

Now, slightly modify this definition such that there is an edge between p and q if and only if there exists a $C(p, q)$ such that there are no vertices of P in the interior of $C(p, q)$ visible to both p and q. Note that this modified definition implies that constraints are not necessarily edges of the graph, since constraints may not necessarily adhere to the visibility property. Indeed, our modified graph is always a subgraph of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph. Therefore, any result proven on our modified graph also holds for the graph that includes all the constraints. As such, we prove the stronger result on our modified graph. For simplicity, in the remainder of the paper, when we refer to the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, we mean our modified subgraph of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph.

2.1 Auxiliary Lemmas

Next, we present three auxiliary lemmas that are needed to prove our main results. First, we reformulate a lemma that appears in [16].

Lemma 1 *Let C be a closed convex curve in the plane. The intersection of two distinct homothets of C is the union of two sets, each of which is either a segment, a single point, or empty.*

Though the following lemma (see also Figure 1) was applied to constrained θ-graphs in [4], the property holds for any visibility graph. We say that a region R *contains* a vertex v if v lies in the interior or on the boundary of R. We call a region *empty* if it does not contain any vertex of P in its interior. We also note that we distinguish between *vertices* and *points*. A *point* is any point in $\mathbb{R}^2$, while a *vertex* is part of the input.

Lemma 2 *Let u, v, and w be three arbitrary points in the plane such that uw and vw are visibility edges and w is not the endpoint of a constraint intersecting the interior of triangle uvw. Then there exists a convex chain of visibility edges from u to v in triangle uvw, such that the polygon defined by uw, wv and the convex chain is empty and does not contain any constraints.*



Figure 1: The convex chain between vertices u and v, where thick lines are visibility edges.

Let p and q be two vertices that can see each other and let $C(p, q)$ be a convex polygon with p and q on its boundary. Extend to half-lines with source p all constraints and edges that have p as an endpoint and intersect $C(p, q)$ (see Figure 2a). Define the clockwise neighbor of pq to be the half-line that minimizes the strictly positive clockwise angle with pq and define the counterclockwise neighbor of pq to be the half-line that minimizes the strictly positive counterclockwise angle with pq. We define the *cone* C_q^p that contains q to be the region between the clockwise and counterclockwise neighbor of pq. Finally, let $C(p, q)_q^p$, the *region of $C(p, q)$ that contains q with respect to p*, be the intersection of $C(p, q)$ and C_q^p (see Figure 2b).

Lemma 3 *Let p and q be two vertices that can see each other and let $C(p, q)$ be any convex polygon with p and q on its boundary. If there is a vertex x in $C(p, q)_q^p$ (other than p and q) that is visible to p, then there is a vertex y (other than p and q) that is visible to both p and q and such that triangle pyq is empty.*

Proof. We have two visibility edges, namely pq and px. Since x lies in $C(p, q)_q^p$, p is not the endpoint of a constraint such that q and x lie on opposite sides of the line through this constraint. Hence, we can apply Lemma 2 and we obtain a convex chain of visibility edges



Figure 2: Defining the region of $C(p, q)$ that contains q with respect to p: (a) The clockwise and counterclockwise neighbor of pq are the half-lines through pr and ps, (b) $C(p, q)_q^p$ is shaded gray.

from x to q and the polygon defined by pq, px and the convex chain is empty and does not contain any constraints. Furthermore, since the convex chain is contained in triangle pxq, which in turn is contained in $C(p, q)$, every vertex along the convex chain is contained in $C(p, q)$ (see Figure 3).



Figure 3: Vertex y lies in $C(p, q)$ and is visible to both p and q.

Let y be the neighbor of q along this convex chain. Hence, y is visible to q and contained in $C(p, q)$. Furthermore, p can see y, since the line segment py is contained in the polygon defined by pq, px and the convex chain, which is empty and does not contain any constraints. This also implies that triangle pyq is empty. □

3 The Constrained Generalized Delaunay Graph

Before we show that every constrained generalized Delaunay graph is a spanner, we first show that they are plane.

3.1 Planarity

In order to show that the constrained generalized Delaunay graph is plane, we first observe that no edge of the graph can contain a vertex, as this vertex would lie in $C(p, q)$ and be visible to both endpoints of the edge.

Observation 4 *Let pq be an edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph. The line segment pq does not contain any vertices other than p and q.*

Lemma 5 *The constrained generalized Delaunay graph is plane.*

Proof. We prove this by contradiction, so assume that there exist two edges pq and rs that intersect properly, i.e. not at their endpoints. It follows from Observation 4 that neither p nor q lies on rs and that neither r nor s lies on pq, so the edges intersect properly. Since pq is contained in $C(p, q)$ and rs is contained in $C(r, s)$, the boundaries of $C(p, q)$ and $C(r, s)$ intersect or one of $C(p, q)$ and $C(r, s)$ contains the other.



Figure 4: $C(p, q)$ and $C(r, s)$ intersect and p and q intersect $C(r, s)$ at x and y.

We first show that this implies that $p \in C(r, s)$, $q \in C(r, s)$, $r \in C(p, q)$, or $s \in C(p, q)$. If one of $C(p, q)$ and $C(r, s)$ contains the other, this holds trivially. If the two homothets intersect and either $p \in C(r, s)$ or $q \in C(r, s)$, we are done, so assume that neither p nor q lies in $C(r, s)$. Lemma 1 states that the boundaries of $C(p, q)$ and $C(r, s)$ intersect each other at most twice. These intersections split the boundary of $C(p, q)$ into two parts: one that is contained in $C(r, s)$ and one that is not. Since $p \notin C(r, s)$ and $q \notin C(r, s)$, p and q lie on the arc of $C(p, q)$ that is not contained in $C(r, s)$ (see Figure 4). However, pq intersects $C(r, s)$, since otherwise pq cannot intersect rs. Let x and y be the two intersections of pq with the boundary of $C(r, s)$ (if the boundary of $C(r, s)$ is parallel to pq, x and y are the two endpoints of the interval of this intersection). We note that x and y split $C(r, s)$ into two parts, one of which is contained in $C(p, q)$, and that r and s cannot lie on the same part. In particular, one of r and s lies on the part that is contained in $C(p, q)$, proving that $r \in C(p, q)$, or $s \in C(p, q)$.

In the remainder of the proof, we assume without loss of generality that $r \in C(p, q)$ (see Figure 4). Let z be the intersection of pq and rs. Hence, z can see both p and r. Also, z is not the endpoint of a constraint intersecting the interior of triangle pzr. Therefore, it

follows from Lemma 2 that there exists a convex chain of visibility edges from p to r. Let v be the neighbor of p along this convex chain. Since v is part of the convex chain, which is contained in pzr, which in turn is contained in $C(p,q)$, it follows that v is a vertex visible to p contained in $C(p,q)$. Furthermore, since the polygon defined by pz, zr and the convex chain does not contain any constraints, v lies in $C(p,q)_q^p$. Thus, it follows from Lemma 3 that there exists a vertex in $C(p,q)$ that is visible to both p and q, contradicting that pq is an edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph. □

3.2 Spanning Ratio

Let x and y be two distinct points on the boundary ∂C of C. These two points split ∂C into two parts. For each of these parts, there exists an isosceles triangle with base xy such that the third vertex lies on that part of ∂C. We denote the base angles of these two triangles by $\alpha_{x,y}$ and $\alpha'_{x,y}$. We define α_C as follows:

$$\alpha_C = \min\{\max(\alpha_{x,y}, \alpha'_{x,y}) : x, y \in \partial C, x \neq y\}. \tag{1}$$

Given a graph G and an angle $0 < \alpha < \pi/2$, we say that an edge pq of G satisfies the *α-diamond property*, when at least one of the two isosceles triangles with base pq and base angle α does not contain any vertex visible to both p and q. A graph G satisfies the α-diamond property when all of its edges satisfy this property [12]. Some examples of α_C are the following: When C is a circle, $\alpha_C = \pi/4$, when C is a rectangle where l and s are the length of its long and short side, $\alpha_C = \tan^{-1}(s/l)$, and when C is an equilateral triangle, $\alpha_C = \pi/3$.

Lemma 6 *Let C be any convex polygon. The constrained generalized Delaunay graph satisfies the α_C-diamond property.*

Proof. Let pq be any edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph. Since pq is an edge, there exists a $C(p,q)$ such that $C(p,q)$ does not contain any vertices that are visible to both p and q. The vertices p and q split the boundary $\partial C(p,q)$ of $C(p,q)$ into two parts and each of these parts defines an isosceles triangle with base pq. Let β and γ be the base angles of these two isosceles triangles and assume without loss of generality that $\beta \geq \gamma$ (see Figure 5). Let x be the third vertex of the isosceles triangle having base angle β.

Translate and scale $C(p,q)$ such that it corresponds to C. This transformation does not affect the angles β and γ. Hence, since $p \neq q$ and both lie on the boundary of $C(p,q)$, the pair $\{\beta, \gamma\}$ is one of the pairs considered when determining α_C in Equation 1. Hence, since $\beta \geq \gamma$, it follows that $\alpha_C \leq \beta$. Let y be the third vertex of the isosceles triangle having base pq and base angle α_C that lies on the same side of pq as triangle pxq (see Figure 5). Since $\alpha_C \leq \beta$, triangle pyq is contained in triangle pxq. By convexity of $C(p,q)$, pxq is contained in $C(p,q)$. Hence, since $C(p,q)$ does not contain any vertices visible to both p and q, triangle pyq does not contain any vertices visible to both p and q either. Hence, pq



Figure 5: The constrained generalized Delaunay graph satisfies the α_C-diamond property.

satisfies the α_C-diamond property. □

For the next property, let O be a point in the interior of C and let x and y be two distinct points on ∂C, such that x, y, and O are collinear. Again, x and y split ∂C into two parts. Let $\ell_{x,y}$ and $\ell'_{x,y}$ denote the length of these two parts. We define $\kappa_{C,O}$ as follows:

$$\kappa_{C,O} = \max\left\{\frac{\max(\ell_{x,y}, \ell'_{x,y})}{|xy|} : x, y \in \partial C, x \neq y, \text{and } x, y, \text{and } O \text{ are collinear}\right\}.$$

We note that the constrained generalized Delaunay graph does not depend on the location of O inside C, as the presence of any edge pq is defined in terms of $C(p,q)$, which does not depend on the location of O. Therefore, we define κ_C as follows:

$$\kappa_C = \min\{\kappa_{C,O} : O \text{ is in the interior of } C\}.$$

Throughout the remainder of this section, we assume that O is picked such that $\kappa_C = \kappa_{C,O}$. Some examples of κ_C are the following: When C is a circle, $\kappa_C = \pi/2$ with O being the center of C, when C is a rectangle where l and s are the length of its long and short side, $\kappa_C = (l+s)/s = l/s+1$ with O being the center of C, and when C is an equilateral triangle, $\kappa_C = \sqrt{3}$ with O being the center of C.

Given a constrained generalized Delaunay graph G, let p and q be two vertices on the boundary of a face f of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, such that p can see q and the line segment pq does not intersect the exterior of f. If for every such pair p and q on every face f, there exists a path in G of length at most $\kappa \cdot |pq|$, then G satisfies the *visible-pair κ-spanner property*. We show that the constrained generalized Delaunay graph satisfies the visible-pair κ_C-spanner property. However, before we do this, we bound the length of the union of the boundary of a sequence of homothets that have their centers on a line.

Let a set of $k+1$ vertices $v_1, ..., v_{k+1}$ be given, such that all vertices lie on one side of the line through v_1 and v_{k+1}. For ease of exposition, assume the line through v_1 and v_{k+1} is the x-axis and all vertices lie on or above this line. We consider only point sets for which there exists $C_1, ..., C_k$, a set of homothets of C, such that the center of each homothet lies on the x-axis, C_i has v_i and v_{i+1} on its boundary, and no C_i contains any vertices other

than v_i and v_{i+1}. Let ∂C be the boundary of C above the x-axis and let $\partial(v_i, v_{i+1})$ be the part of the boundary of C_i between v_i and v_{i+1} that lies above the x-axis.

Lemma 7 *Let $C(v_1, v_{k+1})$ be the homothet with v_1 and v_{k+1} on its boundary and its center on the x-axis. It holds that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} |\partial(v_i, v_{i+1})| \leq |\partial C(v_1, v_{k+1})|.$$

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on k, the number of homothets. If $k = 1$, $\partial(v_1, v_2)$ is the same as $\partial C(v_1, v_2)$, so the lemma holds.

If $k > 1$, we assume that the induction hypothesis holds for all sets of at most $k - 1$ homothets. Since homothet C_i does not contain any vertices other than v_i and v_{i+1}, it follows that none of the homothets are fully contained in the union of the other homothets.

Let C_{k-1} be the homothet that defines the rightmost intersection r with the x-axis when C_k is not part of the set of homothets. Let l be the leftmost intersection of C_k and the x-axis (see Figure 6). Let $\partial(v_1, v_k) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} \partial(v_i, v_{i+1})$ and let $\partial(v_k, r)$ be the part of ∂C_{k-1} between v_k and r above the x-axis. Let $\partial(l, v_k)$ be the part of ∂C_k between l and v_k above the x-axis. To prove the lemma, we need to show that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} |\partial(v_i, v_{i+1})| = |\partial(v_1, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, v_{k+1})| \leq |\partial C(v_1, v_{k+1})|$.



Figure 6: The partial boundaries $\partial(v_1, v_k)$ and $\partial(v_k, v_{k+1})$ (blue), $\partial(l, v_k)$ and $\partial(v_k, r)$ (red), and $\partial C(l, r)$ (orange): (a) l lies to the left of r, (b) l lies on or to the right of r.

Let $c = |\partial C(v_1, v_{k+1})|/|v_1 v_{k+1}|$, so $|\partial C(v_1, v_{k+1})| = c \cdot |v_1 v_{k+1}|$. Since $|\partial(v_1, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, r)| = |\partial(v_1, v_{k-1})| + |\partial(v_{k-1}, r)|$, it follows from the induction hypothesis that $|\partial(v_1, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, r)| = |\partial(v_1, v_{k-1})| + |\partial(v_{k-1}, r)| \leq |\partial C(v_1, r)| = c \cdot |v_1 r|$. Since the center of C_k lies on the x-axis, it follows that $|\partial C_k| = |\partial(l, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, v_{k+1})| = c \cdot |l v_{k+1}|$. We consider two cases: (a) l lies to the left of r, (b) l lies on or to the right of r.

Case (a): If l lies to the left of r, let $C(l, r)$ be the homothet centered on the x-axis with l and r on its boundary (see Figure 6a). Hence, it follows that $|\partial C(l, r)| = c \cdot |lr|$. Since $C(l, r)$ has l and on its left boundary, it is contained in C_k, and since it has r on its right boundary, it is contained in C_{k-1}. Hence, $C(l, r)$ is contained in the intersection of C_{k-1} and C_k. Since the length of the boundary of this intersection above the x-axis is

$|\partial(l, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, r)|$ and $C(l, r)$ is convex, it follows that $|\partial C(l, r)| \leq |\partial(l, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, r)|$. Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{k} |\partial(v_i, v_{i+1})| &= |\partial(v_1, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, v_{k+1})| \\
&= |\partial(v_1, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, r)| - |\partial(v_k, r)| + |\partial C_k| - |\partial(l, v_k)| \\
&\leq c \cdot |v_1 r| - |\partial(v_k, r)| + c \cdot |l v_{k+1}| - |\partial(l, v_k)| \\
&= c \cdot |v_1 v_{k+1}| + c \cdot |lr| - |\partial(l, v_k)| - |\partial(v_k, r)| \\
&= |\partial C(v_1, v_{k+1})| + |\partial C(l, r)| - |\partial(l, v_k)| - |\partial(v_k, r)| \\
&\leq |\partial C(v_1, v_{k+1})|.
\end{aligned}$$

Case (b): If l lies on or to the right of r (see Figure 6b), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{k} |\partial(v_i, v_{i+1})| &= |\partial(v_1, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, v_{k+1})| \\
&\leq |\partial(v_1, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, r)| + |\partial(l, v_k)| + |\partial(v_k, v_{k+1})| \\
&\leq c \cdot |v_1 r| + c \cdot |l v_{k+1}| \\
&\leq c \cdot |v_1 v_{k+1}| \\
&= |\partial C(v_1, v_{k+1})|,
\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

Lemma 8 *The constrained generalized Delaunay graph satisfies the visible-pair κ_C-spanner property.*

Proof. Let p and q be two vertices on the boundary of a face f of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, such that p can see q and the line segment pq does not intersect the exterior of f. Assume without loss of generality that pq lies on the x-axis. Let $C(p, q)$ be the homothet of C with p and q on its boundary and its center on pq. We aim to show that there exists a path between p and q of length at most $\kappa_C \cdot |pq|$. Since by definition κ_C is at least $|\partial C(p, q)|/|pq|$, showing that there exists a path between p and q of length at most $|\partial C(p, q)|$ completes the proof. If pq is an edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, this follows from the triangle inequality, so assume this is not the case.

We grow a homothet C' with its center on pq by moving its center from p to q, while maintaining that p lies on the boundary of C' (see Figure 7a). Let v_1 be the first vertex hit by C' that is visible to p and lies in $C(p, q)_q^p$. We assume without loss of generality that v_1 lies above pq. Since v_1 is the first vertex satisfying these conditions, pv_1 is either an edge or a constraint: Since v_1 is the first visible vertex we hit in $C(p, q)_q^p$, we have that $C(p, q)_q^p \cap C'$ contains no vertices visible to p. Hence, there is no vertex visible to both p and v_1. Therefore, Lemma 3 implies that $C(p, q)_q^p \cap C'$ does not contain any vertices visible



Figure 7: Constructing a path from p to q: (a) growing C' from p, (b) growing C' while maintaining that v_i lies on its boundary, (c) refining when v_iv_{i+1} is a constraint.

to v_1. Finally, if pv_1 is not a constraint, $C(p,q)^p_q \cap C'$ contains the region that is visible to both p and v_1. Hence, if pv_1 is not a constraint, the region that is visible to both p and v_1 does not contain any vertices and pv_1 is an edge.

We continue constructing a sequence of vertices $p, v_1, v_2, ..., v_k, q$ until we hit q by moving the center of C' along pq towards q and each time we hit a vertex v_i, we require that it lies on the boundary of C' until we hit the next vertex v_{i+1} that is visible to v_i and v_i is not the endpoint of a constraint that lies in the counterclockwise angle $\angle v_{i-1}v_iv_{i+1}$ (see Figure 7b). Since v_{i+1} is the first vertex satisfying these conditions starting from v_i, v_iv_{i+1} is either an edge or a constraint. This in turn implies that these vertices all lie above pq, since pq is visible and does not intersect the exterior of f.

Unfortunately, we cannot assume that there exists an edge between every pair of consecutive vertices: If v_iv_{i+1} is a constraint, there can be vertices visible to both v_i and v_{i+1} on the opposite side of the constraint. For pairs of vertices v_i, v_{i+1} that do not form an edge, we refine the construction of the sequence between them: We start with C' such that it does not cross v_iv_{i+1} and v_i lies on its boundary. We construct a sequence of vertices from v_i to v_{i+1} by moving the center of C' along pq towards q, maintaining that v_i lies on its boundary (see Figure 7c). For the first vertex we hit, we require that it is visible to v_i and lies in $C'^{v_i}_{v_{i+1}}$.

We continue moving the center of C' along pq towards q, but we now maintain that v'_i lies on the boundary of C'. Each time we hit a vertex v_j, we require that it lies on the boundary of C' until we hit the next vertex v'_{j+1} that is visible to v_j and v_j is not the endpoint of a constraint that lies in the counterclockwise angle $\angle v_{j-1}v_jv_{j+1}$. In other words, we construct a more fine-grained sequence when consecutive vertices define a constraint and there is no edge between them. Note that we may need to repeat this process a number of times, since there need not be edges between the vertices of the finer grained sequence either. However, since the point set is finite, this process terminates.

This way, we end up with a path $p, v'_1, v'_2, ..., v'_l, q$ from p to q that lies above pq. Furthermore, since C is convex, we can upper bound the length of each edge v_iv_{i+1} by the part of the boundary of $C(v_i, v_{i+1})$, the homothet with v_i and v_{i+1} on its boundary and its center on pq, that does not intersect pq. Hence, the total length of the path is upper bounded by the length of the union of the boundaries of these homothets above pq.

By construction, none of the homothets corresponding to consecutive vertices along the path contain any of the other vertices along the path. Hence, we can apply Lemma 7 and it follows that the total length of the path is at most $|\partial C(p,q)|$, completing the proof. □

We are now ready to prove that the constrained generalized Delaunay graph is a spanner. Das and Joseph [12] showed that any plane graph that satisfies the diamond property and the good polygon property (similar to the visible-pair κ-spanner property) is a spanner. Subsequently, Bose *et al.* [6] improved slightly on the spanning ratio. They showed that a geometric (constrained) graph G is a spanner of the visibility graph when it satisfies the following properties:

1. G is plane.
2. G satisfies the α-diamond property.
3. The spanning ratio of any one-sided path in G is at most κ.
4. G satisfies the visible-pair κ'-spanner property.

In particular, G is a t-spanner for

$$t = 2\kappa\kappa' \cdot \max\left(\frac{3}{\sin(\alpha/2)}, \kappa\right).$$

It follows from Lemmas 5, 6, and 8 that the constrained generalized Delaunay graph satisfies these four properties. Moreover, even though in general the constrained generalized Delaunay graph is not a triangulation, if for a specific convex shape it is, it satisfies the visible-pair 1-spanner property: Since every face consists of three vertices that are pairwise connected by an edge, the shortest path between two vertices p and q on this face has length $1 \cdot |pq|$. Therefore, we obtain the following theorem:

Theorem 9 *The constrained generalized Delaunay graph G is a t-spanner for*

$$t = \begin{cases} 2\kappa_C \cdot \max\left(\frac{3}{\sin(\alpha_C/2)}, \kappa_C\right), & \text{if } G \text{ is a triangulation} \\ 2\kappa_C^2 \cdot \max\left(\frac{3}{\sin(\alpha_C/2)}, \kappa_C\right), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

4 The Constrained Empty-Rectangle Delaunay Graph

In this section, we look at the case where the empty convex shape is an arbitrary rectangle. We assume without loss of generality that the rectangle is axis-aligned. We do not, however, assume anything about the ratio between the height and width of the rectangle. We first show that if two visible vertices cannot see any vertices in $C(p,q)$ on one side of pq, then no vertex in $C(p,q)$ on the opposite side of pq can see any vertices beyond pq either.

Lemma 10 *Let p and q be two vertices that can see each other, such that pq is not vertical, and let $C(p,q)$ be any convex polygon with p and q on its boundary. If the region of $C(p,q)$ below pq does not contain any vertices visible to p and q, then no point x in $C(p,q)$ above pq can see any vertices in $C(p,q)$ below pq.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by contradiction, so assume that there exists a vertex y in $C(p,q)$ below pq that is visible to x, but not to p and q. Since $C(p,q)$ is a convex polygon and x and y lie on opposite sides of pq, the visibility edge xy intersects pq. Let z be this intersection (see Figure 8).



Figure 8: If x can see a vertex below pq, then so can q.

Hence, zy and zq are visibility edges. Since z is not a vertex, it is not the endpoint of any constraints intersecting the interior of triangle yzq. It follows from Lemma 2 that there exists a convex chain of visibility edges between y and q and this chain is contained in yzq. However, this implies that w, the neighbor of q along this chain, is visible to q and lies in $C(p,q)$ below pq. Next, we apply Lemma 2 on triangle pqw and find that the neighbor of p along the chain from p to w is visible to both p and q and lies in $C(p,q)$ below pq, contradicting that this region does not contain any vertices visible to p and q. □

Next, we introduce some notation for the following lemma. Let p and q be two vertices of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph that can see each other. Let R be a rectangle with p and q on its West and East boundary and let a, b, and r be the Northwest, Northeast, and Southwest corner of R. Let $m_1, ..., m_{k-1}$ be any $k-1$ points on pq in the order they are visited when walking from p to q (see Figure 9). Let $m_0 = p$ and $m_k = q$. Consider the homothets S_i of R with m_i and m_{i+1} on their respective boundaries, for $0 \leq i < k$, such that $|pa|/|ra| = |m_i a_i|/|r_i a_i|$, where a_i, b_i, r_i are the Northwest, Northeast, and Southwest corner of S_i.

Lemma 11 *We have*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \big(|m_i a_i| + |a_i b_i| + |b_i m_{i+1}|\big) = |pa| + |ab| + |bq|.$$



Figure 9: The total length of the sides of the rectangles S_i equals that of $C(p, q)$.

Proof. Let $c = (|pa| + |ab| + |bq|)/|pq|$. We first show that for every S_i we have that $(|m_i a_i| + |a_i b_i| + |b_i m_{i+1}|)/|m_i m_{i+1}| = c$, for $0 \leq i < k$. Since S_i is a homothet of R and the slopes of $m_i m_{i+1}$ and pq are equal, we have that $|ab|/|pq| = |a_i b_i|/|m_i m_{i+1}|$. Furthermore, by construction $|pa|/|ra| = |m_i a_i|/|r_i a_i|$, and since the slopes of $m_i m_{i+1}$ and pq are equal, we also have that $|bq|/|ra| = |b_i m_{i+1}|/|r_i a_i|$. Finally, since S_i is a homothet of R, we have that $|pq|/|ra| = |m_i m_{i+1}|/|r_i a_i|$, which gives $|pa|/|pq| = |m_i a_i|/|m_i m_{i+1}|$ and $|bq|/|pq| = |b_i m_{i+1}|/|m_i m_{i+1}|$.

Hence, since $(|m_i a_i| + |a_i b_i| + |b_i m_{i+1}|)/|m_i m_{i+1}| = c$, for $0 \leq i < k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \big(|m_i a_i| + |a_i b_i| + |b_i m_{i+1}|\big) &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \big(c \cdot |m_i m_{i+1}|\big) \\ &= c \cdot |pq| \\ &= |pa| + |ab| + |bq|,\end{aligned}$$

proving the lemma. □

Before we prove the bound on the spanning ratio of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, we first bound the length of the spanning path between vertices p and q for the case where the rectangle $C(p, q)$ is partially empty. We call a rectangle $C(p, q)$ *half-empty* when $C(p, q)$ contains no vertices in $C(p, q)^p_q$ below pq that are visible to p and no vertices in $C(p, q)^q_p$ below pq that are visible to q. We denote the x- and y-coordinate of a point p by p_x and p_y.

Lemma 12 *Let p and q be two vertices that can see each other. Let $C(p, q)$ be a rectangle with p and q on its boundary, such that it is half-empty. Let a and b be the corners of $C(p, q)$ on the non-half-empty side. The constrained generalized Delaunay graph contains a path between p and q of length at most $|pa| + |ab| + |bq|$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on the rank of $C(x, y)$ when ordered by size, for any two visible vertices x and y, such that $C(x, y)$ is half-empty. We assume without loss

of generality that p lies on the West boundary, q lies on the East boundary and that $C(p,q)$ is half-empty below pq. This implies that a and b are the Northwest and Northeast corner of $C(p,q)$. We also assume without loss of generality that the slope of pq is non-negative, i.e. $p_x < q_x$ and $p_y \leq q_y$ (see Figure 10). Note that this can be achieved by swapping p and q, if needed.



Figure 10: An inductive path from p to q.

We note that the case where p lies on the West boundary, q lies on the North boundary and $C(p,q)$ is half-empty below pq can be viewed as a special case of the one above: We shrink $C(p,q)$ until one of p and q lies in a corner. This point can now be viewed as being on both sides defining the corner and hence p and q are on opposite sides: If p lies in the Southwest corner, we treat it as lying on the South boundary while q lies on the North boundary. If q lies in the Northeast corner, we treat it as lying on the East boundary while p lies on the West boundary. An analogous statement holds for the case where p lies on the West boundary, q lies on the North boundary and $C(p,q)$ is half-empty above pq.

Let r be the Southwest corner of $C(p,q)$. Let R be a homothet of $C(p,q)$ that is contained in $C(p,q)$ and whose West boundary is intersected by pq. Let a', b', r' be the Northwest, Northeast, and Southwest corner of R and let m be the intersection of $a'r'$ and pq. We call homothet R *similar* to $C(p,q)$ if and only if $|pa|/|ra| = |ma'|/|r'a'|$.

Base case: If $C(p,q)$ is a half-empty rectangle of smallest area, then $C(p,q)$ does not contain any vertices visible to both p and q: Assume this is not the case and grow a rectangle R similar to $C(p,q)$ from p to q. Let x be the first vertex hit by R that is visible to p and lies in $C(p,q)^p_q$. Note that this implies that R is contained in $C(p,q)$. Therefore, R is smaller than $C(p,q)$. Furthermore, R is half-empty: By Lemma 10, the part below the line through p and q does not contain any vertices visible to p or x in $C(p,q)^p_q$, and the part between the line through p and x and the line through p and q does not contain any vertices visible to p or x since x is the first visible vertex hit while growing R. However, this contradicts that $C(p,q)$ is the smallest half-empty rectangle.

Hence, $C(p,q)$ does not contain any vertices visible to both p and q, which implies that pq is an edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph. Therefore the length of the shortest path from p to q is at most $|pq| \leq |pa| + |ab| + |bq|$.

Induction step: We assume that for all half-empty rectangles $C(x, y)$ smaller than $C(p, q)$ the lemma holds. If pq is an edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, the length of the shortest path from p to q is at most $|pq| \leq |pa| + |ab| + |bq|$.

If pq is not an edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, there exists a vertex in $C(p, q)$ that is visible from both p and q. We grow a rectangle R similar to $C(p, q)$ from p to q. Let x be the first vertex hit by R that is visible to p and lies in $C(p, q)_q^p$ and let a' and b' be the Northwest and Northeast corner of R (see Figure 10). Note that this implies that R is contained in $C(p, q)$. We also note that px is not necessarily an edge in the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, since if it is a constraint, there can be vertices visible to both p and x above px. However, since R is half-empty and smaller than $C(p, q)$, we can apply induction on it and we obtain that the path from p to x has length at most $|pa'| + |a'b'| + |b'x|$ when x lies on the East boundary of R, and that the path from p to x has length at most $|pa'| + |a'x|$ when x lies on the North boundary of R.

Let m_0 be the projection of x along the vertical axis onto pq. Since m_0 is contained in R, x can see m_0. Since xm_0 and m_0q are visibility edges and m_0 is not the endpoint of a constraint intersecting the interior of triangle xm_0q, we can apply Lemma 2 and obtain a convex chain $x = p_0, p_1, ..., p_k = q$ of visibility edges (see Figure 10). For each of these visibility edges p_ip_{i+1}, there is a homothet R_i of $C(p, q)$ that falls in one of the following three types (see Figure 11): (i) p_i lies on the North boundary and p_{i+1} lies in the Southeast corner, (ii) p_i lies on the West boundary and p_{i+1} lies on the East boundary and the slope of p_ip_{i+1} is negative, (iii) p_i lies on the West boundary and p_{i+1} lies on the East boundary and the slope of p_ip_{i+1} is not negative. Note that the case where p_i lies on the South boundary and p_{i+1} lies on the North boundary cannot occur, since the slope of any p_ip_{i+1} is at most that of pq. Also note that the case where p_i lies on the South boundary and p_{i+1} lies on the East boundary cannot occur, since we can shrink the rectangle until p lies in the Southwest corner, resulting in a Type (iii) rectangle. Let a_i and b_i be the Northwest and Northeast corner of R_i. We note that by convexity, these three types occur in the order Type (i), Type (ii), and Type (iii).



Figure 11: The three types of rectangles along the convex chain.

Let m_i be the projection of p_i along the vertical axis onto pq, let C_i be the homothet of $C(p,q)$ with m_i and m_{i+1} on its boundary that is similar to $C(p,q)$, and let a'_i and b'_i be the Northwest and Northeast corner of C_i. Using these C_i, we shift Type (ii) and Type (iii) rectangles down as far as possible: We shift R_i down until either p_i or p_{i+1} lies in one of the North corners or the South boundary corresponds to the South boundary of C_i. In the latter case, R_i and C_i are the same rectangle.

Since all rectangles R_i are smaller than $C(p,q)$, we can apply induction, provided that we can show that R_i is half-empty. For Type (i) visibility edges, the part of the rectangle that lies below the line through p_i and p_{i+1} is contained in R, which does not contain any visible vertices, and the region of $C(p,q)^p_q$ below the convex chain, which is empty. For Type (ii) and Type (iii) visibility edges, the part of the rectangle that lies below the line through p_i and p_{i+1} is contained in the region of $C(p,q)^p_q$ below the convex chain, which is empty, and the region of $C(p,q)$ below the line through p and q, which does not contain any visible vertices by Lemma 10. Hence, all R_i are half-empty and we obtain an inductive path of length at most: (i) $|p_ib_i| + |b_ip_{i+1}|$, (ii) $|p_ia_i| + |a_ib_i| + |b_ip_{i+1}|$, (iii) $|p_ia_i| + |a_ib_i| + |b_ip_{i+1}|$.

To bound the total path length, we perform case distinction on the location of x on R and whether the convex path from x to q goes down: (a) x lies on the East boundary of R and the convex path does not go down, (b) x lies on the East boundary of R and the convex path goes down, (c) x lies on the North boundary of R and the convex path does not go down, (d) x lies on the North boundary of R and the convex path goes down.

Case (a): The vertex x lies on the East boundary of R and the convex path does not go down. Recall that the length of the path from p to x is at most $|pa'| + |a'b'| + |b'x|$, which is at most $|pa'| + |a'b'| + |b'm_0|$. Since the convex chain does not go down, it cannot contain any Type (i) or Type (ii) visibility edges. Furthermore, since x lies on the East boundary of R, R and all C_i are disjoint. Thus, Lemma 11 implies that the boundaries above pq of R and all C_i sum up to $|pa| + |ab| + |bq|$. Hence, if we can show that, for all R_i, $|p_ia_i| + |a_ib_i| + |b_ip_{i+1}| \leq |m_ia'_i| + |a'_ib'_i| + |b'_im_{i+1}|$, the proof of this case is complete.

By convexity, the slope of p_ip_{i+1} is at most that of pq and m_im_{i+1}. Hence, when p_{i+1} lies in the Northeast corner of R_i, we have $p_{i+1} = b_i$ and $|p_ia_i|+|a_ip_{i+1}| \leq |m_ia'_i|+|a'_ib'_i|+|b'_im_{i+1}|$. If p_{i+1} does not lie in the Northeast corner, $R_i = C_i$. Hence, since p_i and p_{i+1} lie above pq, we have that $|p_ia_i| + |a_ib_i| + |b_ip_{i+1}| \leq |m_ia'_i| + |a'_ib'_i| + |b'_im_{i+1}|$.

Case (b): The vertex x lies on the East boundary of R and the convex path goes down. Recall that the length of the path from p to x is at most $|pa'| + |a'b'| + |b'x|$. Let p_j be the lowest vertex along the convex chain. Since p_j lies above pq and pq has non-negative slope, the descent of the convex path is at most $|xm_0|$. Hence, when we charge this to R, we used $|pa'| + |a'b'| + |b'm_0|$ of its boundary (see Figure 12).

Like in the Case (a), since x lies on the East boundary of R, R and all C_i are disjoint. Thus, Lemma 11 implies that the boundaries above pq of R and all C_i sum up to $|pa| + |ab| + |bq|$. Hence, if we can show that, for all R_i, the inductive path length is at most $|m_ia'_i| + |a'_ib'_i| + |b'_im_{i+1}|$, the proof of this case is complete.

For Type (i) visibility edges, we have already charged $|b_ip_{i+1}|$ to R, so it remains to show that $|p_ib_i| \leq |m_ia'_i| + |a'_ib'_i| + |b'_im_{i+1}|$. This follows, since m_i and m_{i+1} are the vertical projections of p_i and p_{i+1}, which implies that $|p_ib_i| = |a'_ib'_i|$.



Figure 12: Going down along the convex chain (blue) is charged to R (orange).



Figure 13: Charging the path from p to p_j to $C(p, p_j)$.

For Type (ii) visibility edges, we already charged $|b_i p_{i+1}| - |p_i a_i|$ to R, so we can consider $p_i p_{i+1}$ to be horizontal and it remains to charge the remaining $2 \cdot |p_i a_i| + |a_i b_i|$. If p_i lies in the Northwest corner of R_i, it follows that $|p_i a_i| = 0$ and we have that $|p_i b_i| = |a'_i b'_i| \leq |m_i a'_i| + |a'_i b'_i| + |b'_i m_{i+1}|$. If p_i does not lie in the Northwest corner, R_i is the same as C_i. Hence, since we can consider $p_i p_{i+1}$ to be horizontal and p_i and p_{i+1} lie above pq, it follows that $2 \cdot |p_i a_i| + |a_i b_i| \leq |m_i a'_i| + |a'_i b'_i| + |b'_i m_{i+1}|$.

Finally, Type (iii) visibility edges are charged as in Case (a), hence we have that $|p_i a_i| + |a_i b_i| + |b_i p_{i+1}| \leq |m_i a'_i| + |a'_i b'_i| + |b'_i m_{i+1}|$, completing the proof of this case.

Case (c): Vertex x lies on the North boundary of R and the convex path does not go down. Recall that the length of the path from p to x is at most $|pa'| + |a'x|$. Since the convex chain does not go down, it cannot contain any Type (i) or Type (ii) visibility edges. Let p_j be the first vertex along the chain, such that R_{j-1} is the same as C_{j-1}. Since q lies on the East boundary of $C(p, q)$, this condition is satisfied for the last visibility edge along the convex chain, hence p_j exists.

Let $C(p, p_j)$ be the homothet of $C(p, q)$ that has p and p_j on its boundary and is similar $C(p, q)$. Let a'' and b'' be the Northwest and Northeast corners of $C(p, p_j)$ (see Figure 13). Since p_j is first vertex along the convex chain that does not lie in the Northeast corner of R_{j-1}, we have that along the path from p to p_j the projections of $a'x$, all $a_i p_{i+1}$, and $a_{j-1} b_{j-1}$ onto $a''b''$ are disjoint and the projections of pa', all $p_i a_i$, and $p_{j-1} a_{j-1}$ onto pa'' are disjoint. Hence, their lengths sum up to at most $|pa''| + |a''b''|$. Finally, since $|b_{j-1} p_j| \leq |b'' p_j|$, the total length of the path from p to p_j is at most $|pa''| + |a''b''| + |b'' p_j|$, which is at most $|pa''| + |a''b''| + |b'' m_j|$.

All Type (iii) visibility edges following p_j are charged as in Case (a), hence we have that $|p_i a_i| + |a_i b_i| + |b_i p_{i+1}| \leq |m_i a'_i| + |a'_i b'_i| + |b'_i m_{i+1}|$. We now apply Lemma 11 to $C(p, p_j)$ and all C_i following p_j and obtain that the total length of the path from p to q is at most $|pa| + |ab| + |bq|$.

Case (d): Vertex x lies on the North boundary of R and the convex path goes down. Recall that the length of the path from p to x is at most $|pa'| + |a'x|$ and that p_1 is the

neighbor of x along the convex chain. Let $C(p, p_1)$ be the homothet of $C(p, q)$ that has p and p_1 on its boundary and is similar to $C(p, q)$. Let a'' and b'' be the Northwest and Northeast corners of $C(p, p_1)$. Since p_1 lies to the right of R and lower than x, it lies on the East boundary of $C(p, p_1)$. We first show that the length of the path from p to p_1 is at most $|pa''| + |a''b''| + |b''p_1|$.

If xp_1 is a Type (i) visibility edge, the length of the path from x to p_1 is at most $|xb_0|+|b_0p_1|$. Hence we have a path from p to p_1 of length at most $|pa'|+|a'x|+|xb_0|+|b_0p_1| = |pa'| + |a''b''| + |b_0p_1|$. Since $|pa'| \leq |pa''|$ and $|b_0p_1| \leq |b''p_1|$, this implies that the path has length at most $|pa''| + |a''b''| + |b''p_1|$. If xp_1 is a Type (ii) visibility edge and x lies in the Northwest corner an analogous argument shows that the path from p to p_1 is at most $|pa''| + |a''b''| + |b''p_1|$. If xp_1 is a Type (ii) visibility edge and $R_0 = C_0$, we have that the projections of $a'x$ and a_0b_0 onto $a''b''$ are disjoint and the projections of pa' and xa_0 onto pa'' are disjoint. Hence, their total lengths sum up to at most $|pa''| + |a''b''|$. Finally, since $|b_0p_1| \leq |b''p_1|$, the total length of the path from p to p_1 is at most $|pa''| + |a''b''| + |b''p_1|$.

Next, we observe, like in Case (b), that starting from p_1 the convex path cannot go down more than $|p_1m_1|$. Hence, when we charge this to $C(p, p_1)$, we used $|pa''| + |a''b''| + |b''m_1|$ of its boundary. Finally, we use arguments analogous to the ones in Case (b) to show that each inductive path after p_1 has length at most $|m_ia'_i| + |a'_ib'_i| + |b'_im_{i+1}|$. We now apply Lemma 11 to $C(p, p_1)$ and all C_i following p_1 and obtain that the total length of the path from p to q is at most $|pa| + |ab| + |bq|$. □

Using the above lemma, we show that the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, that uses an arbitrary rectangle as its empty convex shape, is a spanner.

Lemma 13 *Let p and q be two vertices that can see each other. Let $C(p, q)$ be the rectangle with p and q on its boundary, such that p lies in a corner of $C(p, q)$. Let l and s be the length of the long and short side of $C(p, q)$. The constrained generalized Delaunay graph contains a path between p and q of length at most $\left(\frac{2l}{s} + 1\right) \cdot (|p_x - q_x| + |p_y - q_y|)$.*

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that p lies on the Southwest corner and q lies on the East boundary. Note that this implies that the slope of pq is non-negative, i.e. $p_x < q_x$ and $p_y \leq q_y$. We prove the lemma by induction on the rank of $C(x, y)$ when ordered by size, for any two visible vertices x and y, such that x lies in a corner of $C(x, y)$. In fact, we show that the constrained generalized Delaunay graph contains a path between x and y of length at most $c \cdot (q_x - p_x) + d \cdot (q_y - p_y)$ and derive bounds on c and d.

Base case: If $C(p, q)$ is the smallest rectangle with p in a corner, then $C(p, q)$ does not contain any vertices visible to both p and q: Let u be a vertex in $C(p, q)$ that is visible to both p and q. Let $C(p, u)$ be the rectangle with p in a corner and u on its boundary. Since u lies in $C(p, q)$, $C(p, u)$ is smaller than $C(p, q)$, contradicting that $C(p, q)$ is the smallest rectangle with p in a corner. Hence, $C(p, q)$ does not contain any vertices visible to both p and q, which implies that pq is an edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph. Hence, the constrained generalized Delaunay graph contains a path between p and q of length at most $|pq| \leq (q_x - p_x) + (q_y - p_y) \leq c \cdot (q_x - p_x) + d \cdot (q_y - p_y)$, provided that $c \geq 1$ and $d \geq 1$.

Induction step: We assume that for all rectangles $C(x, y)$, with x in some corner of $C(p, q)$, smaller than $C(p, q)$ the lemma holds. If pq is an edge of the constrained generalized Delaunay graph, by the triangle inequality, the length of the shortest path from p to q is at most $|pq| \leq |p_x - q_x| + |p_y - q_y|$.

If there is no edge between p and q, there exists a vertex u in $C(p, q)$ that is visible from both p and q. We first look at the case where u lies below pq. Let g be the intersection of the South boundary of $C(p, q)$ and the line though q parallel to the diagonal of $C(p, q)$ through p, and let h be the Southeast corner of $C(p, q)$ (see Figure 14). If u lies in triangle pgq, by induction we have that the path from p to u has length at most $c \cdot (u_x - p_x) + d \cdot (u_y - p_y)$ and the path from u to q has length at most $c \cdot (q_x - u_x) + d \cdot (q_y - u_y)$. Hence, there exists a path from p to q via u of length at most $c \cdot (q_x - p_x) + d \cdot (q_y - p_y)$.



Figure 14: Rectangle $C(p, q)$ with points g and h.

If u lies in triangle ghq, by induction we have that the path from p to u has length at most $c \cdot (u_x - p_x) + d \cdot (u_y - p_y)$ and the path from q to u has length at most $d \cdot (q_x - u_x) + c \cdot (q_y - u_y)$. When we take c and d to be equal, this implies that there exists a path from p to q via u of length at most $c \cdot (q_x - p_x) + d \cdot (q_y - p_y)$.

If there does not exist a vertex below pq that is visible to both p and q, than Lemma 3 implies that there are no vertices in $C(p, q)_q^p$ below pq that are visible to p and that there are no vertices in $C(p, q)_p^q$ below pq that are visible to q. Hence, we can apply Lemma 12 and obtain that there exists a path between p and q of length at most $|pa| + |ab| + |bq|$, where a and b are the Northwest and Northeast corner of $C(p, q)$. Since $|ab|$ is $(q_x - p_x)$ and $|bq| \leq |pa| \leq \frac{l}{s} \cdot (q_x - p_x)$, we can upper bound $|pa| + |ab| + |bq|$ by $c \cdot (q_x - p_x)$ when c is at least $\left(\frac{2l}{s} + 1\right)$. Hence, since c and d need to be equal, we obtain that all cases work out when $c = d = \left(\frac{2l}{s} + 1\right)$. □

Finally, since $(|p_x - q_x| + |p_y - q_y|)/|pq|$ is at most $\sqrt{2}$, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 14 *The constrained generalized Delaunay graph using an empty rectangle as empty convex shape has spanning ratio at most* $\sqrt{2} \cdot \left(\frac{2l}{s} + 1\right)$.

5 Conclusion

We showed that every constrained generalized Delaunay graph is a plane spanner, whose spanning ratio depends on the α-diamond property and the visible-pair κ-spanner property. In the special case where the empty convex shape is a rectangle, we reduce the spanning ratio by showing that it depends linearly on the aspect ratio of the rectangle used to construct the graph.

In light of other recent results in the constrained setting, such as the fact that Yao- and θ-graphs with sufficiently many cones are spanners, the result presented in this paper raises a tantalizing question: What conditions need to hold for a graph to be a spanner in the constrained setting? In particular, these and previous results show a number of sufficient conditions, but do not immediately give rise to a set of necessary conditions.

References

[1] N. Bonichon, C. Gavoille, N. Hanusse, and L. Perković. The stretch factor of L_1- and L_∞-Delaunay triangulations. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2012)*, volume 7501 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 205–216, 2012.

[2] P. Bose, P. Carmi, S. Collette, and M. Smid. On the stretch factor of convex Delaunay graphs. *Journal of Computational Geometry (JoCG)*, 1(1):41–56, 2010.

[3] P. Bose, L. Devroye, M. Löffler, J. Snoeyink, and V. Verma. Almost all Delaunay triangulations have stretch factor greater than $\pi/2$. *Computational Geometry: Theory and Applications (CGTA)*, 44(2):121–127, 2011.

[4] P. Bose, R. Fagerberg, A. van Renssen, and S. Verdonschot. On plane constrained bounded-degree spanners. In *Proceedings of the 10th Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics (LATIN 2012)*, volume 7256 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 85–96, 2012.

[5] P. Bose and J. M. Keil. On the stretch factor of the constrained Delaunay triangulation. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on Voronoi Diagrams in Science and Engineering (ISVD 2006)*, pages 25–31, 2006.

[6] P. Bose, A. Lee, and M. Smid. On generalized diamond spanners. In *Proceedings of the 10th Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures (WADS 2007)*, volume 4619 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 325–336, 2007.

[7] P. Bose and M. Smid. On plane geometric spanners: A survey and open problems. *Computational Geometry: Theory and Applications (CGTA)*, 46(7):818–830, 2013.

[8] L. P. Chew. There is a planar graph almost as good as the complete graph. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 1986)*, pages 169–177, 1986.

[9] L. P. Chew. There are planar graphs almost as good as the complete graph. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences (JCSS)*, 39(2):205–219, 1989.

[10] K. Clarkson. Approximation algorithms for shortest path motion planning. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 1987)*, pages 56–65, 1987.

[11] G. Das. The visibility graph contains a bounded-degree spanner. In *Proceedings of the 9th Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG 1997)*, pages 70–75, 1997.

[12] G. Das and D. Joseph. Which triangulations approximate the complete graph? In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Optimal Algorithms*, volume 401 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 168–192, 1989.

[13] D. P. Dobkin, S. J. Friedman, and K. J. Supowit. Delaunay graphs are almost as good as complete graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry (DCG)*, 5(1):399–407, 1990.

[14] J. M. Keil and C. A. Gutwin. Classes of graphs which approximate the complete Euclidean graph. *Discrete & Computational Geometry (DCG)*, 7(1):13–28, 1992.

[15] G. Narasimhan and M. Smid. *Geometric Spanner Networks*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[16] K. Swanepoel. Helly-type theorems for homothets of planar convex curves. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 131(3):921–932, 2003.

[17] G. Xia. The stretch factor of the Delaunay triangulation is less than 1.998. *SIAM Journal on Computing (SICOMP)*, 42(4):1620–1659, 2013.

[18] G. Xia and L. Zhang. Toward the tight bound of the stretch factor of Delaunay triangulations. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Canadian Conference on Computational Geometry (CCCG 2011)*, pages 175–180, 2011.